

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Applicants' representatives thank the Examiner for courtesies extended during the telephonic conference on September 26, 2005. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 have been amended per discussions during the interview with the Examiner as indicated at pages 2-4 of this Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen, *et al.* (US 6,507,845 B1) in view of Sluiman, *et al.* (US 6,098,072). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cohen, *et al.* in further view of Sluiman, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The subject invention relates to controlling access to computer objects based on the computer space from which access will occur. For example, access rights to a computer file can be based on user and location, such as only Users A and B are allowed access to the computer file, but only from Networks X and Y. If User C tried to access the computer file, access would be denied and if User A tried to access the computer file from Network Z, access would be denied.

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 10) recites *one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object, at least one of the computer spaces is a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object and at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to access to the computer object for the one or more computer users.*

Cohen, *et al.* does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims. Cohen, *et al.* teaches a system for managing collaboration amongst a group of users involved in a task. The Office Action contends that Figure 10 teaches access control for users and computer locations. However, Figure 10 describes two windows, one showing a list of documents and the other showing a list of users involved in the task and their activity on each document. The box (Element 204) next to each user is defined in the specification as an indicator that merely indicates if the user is active. It does not control access to the document (*See e.g.* Cohen, *et al.* column 6, lines 25-28). Neither window shows any access fields that control access to documents from either a computer location or a computer user as taught in the applicants' claimed invention. Cohen, *et al.* does discuss a sharing function which allows a user to request that one or more other users share a document so that they can work on it together. However, this function does not determine whether the one or more other users have access to the document themselves, without the share session. **Cohen, *et al.* fails to discuss control of access to documents.** It appears that there is an underlying assumption in the prior art that all users associated with a task have access to all documents associated with the task. The Examiner indicates in the Office Action that he is not permitted to "read in" to the words "control" and "controlling" the limitations that the applicant desires. However, the specification clearly provides the necessary support for the definition of the terms access control and controlling access as used in the claims. Specifically, as disclosed in the specification (*See e.g.*, paragraphs [0015-0016, 0018]) controlling access determines from where a computer object may be accessed and users who may access the computer object. The Office Action contends that having access to the user interface of the cited art is analogous to controlling access to the documents. The Examiner employs this logic to argue that users accessing documents as a group define a space. Nonetheless, Cohen, *et al.* fails to disclose any access fields indicating access control to computer objects by user or location. The user interface of the cited reference merely indicates which users are actively working on a document and does not determine who has

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

access to the document. There may be many others who have access that are currently not working on the document and are not indicated in the current view of the interface.

Moreover, as conceded in the Office Action, Cohen, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest controlling access to the computer object from a computer location, and attempts to cite Sluiman, *et al.* to make up for this deficiency. However, Sluiman, *et al.* also fails to teach or suggest control of access to documents. Rather, Sluiman, *et al.* teaches a system for providing alternate directory views of source code files in a file directory system to accommodate the differing requirements of users of those files. This provides users with a way to view the files in a directory hierarchically, flat, or in some other view, while maintaining the original directory structure in which they were saved. The Office Action asserts that Sluiman, *et al.* discloses physical locations from which access can be controlled to computer objects. On the contrary, Sluiman, *et al.* discloses that the physical locations of files are merely represented in differing views to satisfy different user's needs. The location of the computers where users are accessing the files is not used to determine access control to the files. In fact, Sluiman, *et al.* is silent regarding providing any restrictions on access to files, either by user or location of a computer that a user will employ to access the computer object. Therefore, Cohen, *et al.* and Sluiman, *et al.* alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest one or more *access control fields* rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object, at least one of the computer spaces *is a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object* and at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to *access to the computer object for the one or more computer users*.

In view of at least the above, it is respectfully submitted that Cohen, *et al.* in view of Sluiman, *et al.* does not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10 (and claims 2-9 and 11-18 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP688US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



David W. Grillo  
Reg. No. 52,970

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731